



OMELCO STANDING PANEL ON CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

FIRST REPORT

THE 1987 REVIEW OF THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF  
REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT

pam  
JQ672  
H660

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2009 with funding from  
Multicultural Canada; University of Toronto Libraries

<http://www.archive.org/details/1987reviewoffurt00chin>

12 MAR 1987

OMELCO STANDING PANEL ON CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

FIRST REPORT

THE 1987 REVIEW OF THE FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF  
REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT



## Content

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Introduction	1
2	Relationship between the Legislative Council and the Urban Council, the Regional Council, and the District Boards	4
3	Composition of the Executive	11
4	Composition of the Legislature	16
5	Relationship between the Executive and the Legislature	41
6	Electoral Provisions	45
Appendices	Appendix A : Composition of the Panel in 1985-86	
	Appendix B : Composition of the Panel in 1986-87	
	Appendix C : Dates and nature of Panel Meetings	



## Chapter 1 : Introduction

The OMELCO Standing Panel on Constitutional Affairs was set up on 28 September 1984 with the following terms of reference:-

2. To examine proposals for constitutional reform in Hong Kong and to report development and progress to OMELCO. The Panel will:-

- (a) Hear and collate views regarding proposals on constitutional reform.
- (b) Monitor and review policies relating to constitutional reform in Hong Kong and to make suggestions to OMELCO with regard to the improvement of these policies and their implementation.
- (c) Research into the constitutional developments and government structures in relevant territories, as appropriate.
- (d) Meet with the Administration and experts to discuss matters relating to the above activities.
- (e) Discuss and consider any other matters relevant to the furtherance of the objective of the Panel.

### Composition of the Panel

3. The composition of the Panel in the 1985-86 and 1986-87 sessions is shown in Appendix A and B respectively.

### The Panel's Work in 1985-86 and 1986-87

4. The Panel has held a total of 40 meetings, 19 in 1985-86 and 21 in 1986-87. The dates and nature of the meetings are at Appendix C.

5. The Panel agreed that the boundaries of its work would be the 1984 Green Paper and White Paper on the Further Development of Representative Government as well as the Joint Declaration.

6. The Panel submitted two interim reports to the full OMELCO in the 1985-86 session. On 14 March 1986 the Panel reported the progress of its work and sought OMELCO's endorsement regarding its public consultation exercise. On 11 July 1986 the Panel further reported progress, including its preliminary views regarding electoral procedures.

7. During its in-house discussions, the Panel studied the various aspects concerning Hong Kong's constitutional developments which related to the 1987 Review. The Panel also invited the Administration to brief Members on the latest position regarding the subject of elections. In the Panel's study of the subjects of direct elections and the "three-tier" government system in preparation for the 1987 Review, Members met informally with members of the Urban Council, the Regional Council, and the District Boards. The Panel also met a group of District Board members as well as other groups and organisations to hear their views on the further development of representative government.



Public submissions

8. In response to the Panel's invitation, a total of 77 members of the public including groups and organisations submitted their views in writing to the Panel regarding both the scope and content of the 1987 Review. Of these, 23 were from groups and organisations and 54 were from individual members of the public.

0116V

## Chapter 2 : Relationship between the Legislative Council and the Urban Council, the Regional Council, and the District Boards

### Introduction

The Panel discussed the subject of the relationship between the Legislative Council and the Urban Council, the Regional Council, and the District Boards. A series of informal meetings between the Panel and members of the Urban Council/Regional Council and the District Boards were held between 17 November 1986 and 17 December 1986 on the questions of direct elections and the "three-tier" government system.

2. The Panel reviewed the existing position of the relationship between the three different tiers of government in Hong Kong. It took note of the formal constitutional position as regards the relationship between the District Boards, the Urban Council, the Regional Council, and the Legislative Council as well as how this relationship was described in the 1984 Green Paper on the Further Development of Representative Government. The Panel then discussed how the present relationship could be further developed.

3. The Panel noted that the existing "three-tier" system of government was not necessarily a vertical one. Under the present system, District Board members could elect representatives to the Legislative Council in the same way as members of the Urban Council and the Regional Council.

Relationship between Urban Council/Regional Council and District Boards

4. At the in-house discussions of the Panel prior to the series of informal meetings with the members of the District Boards/Urban Council/Regional Council, the Panel noted the following:-

- (a) there was a possible overlap of roles between the Urban Council/Regional Council and the District Boards and that some of these responsibilities could be devolved to the District Boards;
- (b) perhaps a distinction should be made between the advisory and executive roles performed by the District Boards and Urban/Regional Councils. At present, District Boards play an advisory role; they do not perform executive functions. Additionally they do have a political role to play: in the election of Legislative Council Members. It has been suggested that in the future perhaps District Boards could further develop this political role whilst the Urban Council/Regional Council should concentrate on their executive responsibility, namely, the provision of municipal services and cultural/recreational facilities;
- (c) the Urban Council and the Regional Council could continue to be responsible for the formulation of policies affecting the municipal services in their respective areas, as well as making decisions in respect of the planning and budgeting of the financial resources at their disposal. Some of the executive functions regarding the implementation of policies at the

district level could then be left to the individual District Boards. Such an arrangement could reduce some of the existing overlap of roles between the District Boards and the two municipal Councils; and

- (d) it has been suggested that the occasional communication problems between the District Boards and the Urban Council could be reduced by allowing the District Boards to elect representatives onto the Urban Council.

Meetings with Members of the Urban Council/Regional Council and the District Boards

5. During the series of informal meetings between the Panel and members of the District Boards, the Urban Council/Regional Council, the following points were raised:-

- (a) the "three-tier" government system should be retained to achieve better co-ordination in policy formulation and execution at the regional level. However, the relationship between the District Boards and the Urban/Regional Councils should be more clearly defined;
- (b) a "two-tier" government system should be adopted to provide a closer link between central and local authorities. Along this line, the following possibilities were identified:-
  - (i) the Urban/Regional Councils could be disbanded and their functions devolved to the 19 District Boards which would form a system of local authorities with a limited level of executive power; and

- (ii) the Urban/Regional Councils could be combined with the District Boards to form a single urban management body;
- (c) the Urban/Regional Councils should be amalgamated to form a city council responsible for municipal services throughout the entire territory. At the same time, the District Boards should be given a more positive role in district management; and
- (d) the Urban/Regional Councils election procedures should include a system of indirect elections whereby District Board members would be elected to serve on the two Councils.

#### Preliminary views

6. After considering the views expressed the Panel agreed on the following preliminary points. Whereas the existing division of responsibilities and functions was clear amongst the Legislative Council, the Urban/Regional Councils, and the District Boards, there appeared to be a few problematic areas in the day-to-day functioning of the "three-tier" system, especially between the Urban Council/Regional Council and the District Boards.

7. The Panel considered that there should be no change to the overall structure of the "three-tier" system in 1988 and that any proposals for further development should be implemented gradually. The Panel also considered that improvements could be made to the system by way of the following recommendations. The advisory role of the District Boards should be reaffirmed and enhanced. Accordingly, Government should review the system of policy advisory committees with a view to

coordinating the input of the District Boards' advice. Moreover, the District Boards should be given a more active role in participating in local affairs. This could be achieved in two ways:-

- (a) the District Boards could develop a monitoring function in respect of local affairs by keeping watch over the performance of Government departments at the district level; and
- (b) the District Boards could participate in the management of local facilities, such as community centres.

8. The Panel noted the difference between the Urban Council and Regional Council in their composition as regards District Board representation. Urban Council members attended the respective District Boards as ex-officio DB members. However a number of Regional Council seats were allocated to the respective District Boards which elected their representatives to sit on the Regional Council. To rationalize the existing arrangements most Panel Members considered that the urban District Boards should be given the opportunity to elect their representatives to the Urban Council. On the other hand, some Panel Members disagreed on the grounds that Urban Councillors were ex-officio District Board members, and that this arrangement was more suitable for the urban area.

9. For the longer term many Panel Members considered that the functions of the existing "three-tier" system should be reviewed so that these functions could be performed by a streamlined system probably consisting of

only two tiers. The second tier could be district based, with an advisory as well as a management role. As regards regional facilities which would serve a number of districts, many Panel Members felt that the districts concerned should be involved in their planning and management by way of a coordinating body charged with such responsibilities. The minority view was that there was a need to retain the present three tiered structure so that the planning and management of territory-wide and regional facilities, such as cultural centres and museums, could be maintained at a high standard, and with minimum duplication of facilities thus effecting savings to the public purse.

10. In addition, the Panel identified the following issues for further consideration by the Government in the 1987 Review:-

- (a) the number and proportion of appointed members on the Urban/Regional Councils;
- (b) whether the District Board and Urban Council/Regional Council elections should be held on the same day;
- (c) whether the term of office of the District Board and Urban Council/Regional Council members should cover the same period of time;
- (d) the relationship between the "three-tier" system (especially the District Boards) and the various policy advisory committees; and
- (e) the relationship between the Urban/Regional Councils and Legislative Council, especially in relation to the financial autonomy of the Councils and LegCo's role in the overall control of public expenditure.

Relationship Between Legislative Council and Urban  
Council/Regional Council/District Boards

11. Panel Members also reviewed the existing relationship between the Urban Council/Regional Council, the District Boards, and the Legislative Council. As the subject is closely related to the composition of the Legislative Council, this is covered in Chapter 4.

0116V



### Chapter 3 : Composition of the Executive

In discussing the subject of the composition of the executive, the Panel studied the functions and the constitutional position of the Privy Council in the United Kingdom as background information.

2. The Panel studied the role of the Governor and the role and composition of the Executive Council under the current system. It reviewed the proposals regarding the Governor and the Executive Council in the 1984 Green Paper and White Paper on the Further Development of Representative Government, as well as taking into consideration the relevant provisions in the Joint Declaration. The Panel also considered the working relationship between the Executive Council and Government policy branches. Then the Panel considered some options regarding the future composition of the Executive.

#### The United Kingdom Privy Council

3. By way of background information, Members noted the role and composition of the Privy Council as well as an analysis of its comparative applicability in Hong Kong. The Panel was of the opinion that the United Kingdom Privy Council was not directly applicable to Hong Kong because it would be difficult to reconcile the role of the Privy Council with the existing government system in Hong Kong.

#### Selection of the Chief Executive

4. Although some views were suggested to the Panel regarding the selection methods of the Chief Executive, as the question of the selection of the Chief Executive after 1997 was not relevant to the 1987 Review, Panel Members only noted such views.

Composition of the Executive Council

5. Based on public submissions to the Panel and other views expressed in the media regarding the future composition and method of selection of the executive, Members considered a number of options as follows:-

(a) Modification to the Existing System

- (i) One possible option was to continue with the existing appointment system while at the same time making adjustments to the composition of the Executive Council in order to provide a balanced representation of the different sectors of interest in the community. Members of the Executive Council would still be appointed by the Governor who it is hoped would ensure a certain distribution of the seats in the Council amongst appointed Members and elected Legislative Council Members from electoral colleges and functional constituencies. The main advantage of this option was minimization of disruption to the existing system, and at the same time maintaining the simplicity and flexibility of the system.
- (ii) Another variant of the above proposal was for a certain number of seats in the Executive Council to be allocated to Legislative Council Members elected from electoral colleges and functional constituencies. The actual choice of

the candidates would be made by election or through consultation among members of the electoral colleges and functional constituencies respectively.

(b) Selection by Electoral College

Another option was that some Members of the Executive Council would be selected by an electoral college formed by members of District Boards, Urban Council and Regional Council; representatives of functional constituencies and other professional bodies; leaders of prominent local organizations; and Legislative Council Members. The success of this selection method would very much depend on the choice of groups and organizations to be included in the electoral college. The same reservations expressed by some people over the concept of the electoral college in the context of the 1985 Legislative Council elections (i.e. elections to be held amongst a small group of people) might be relevant in this context as well. Furthermore, the question remained as to who should be vested with the authority to decide upon the selection of groups and organizations.

(c) Indirect Election by the Legislative Council

This option was proposed in the 1984 Green Paper on the Further Development of Representative Government. A certain proportion of seats in the Executive Council would be elected by the Legislative Council among its own Members. The main

advantage of this option was the direct linkage it brought between the Executive Council and the Legislative Council. Implementation of the proposal could be phased in such a way as to take into account of changes in the composition of the legislature.

6. Members noted a suggestion for individual Executive Council Members to assume duty as chairmen of main Government policy advisory committees. To provide a system of checks and balances, there was one suggestion that select committees could be set up in the Legislative Council to monitor executive decisions made in respect of different policy areas. The latter suggestion is discussed in Chapter 5.

7. Some Members felt that the choice of the method to be adopted for the selection of Executive Council Members should depend largely upon the future role of the Executive Council and its relationship with the Legislative Council. Other Members thought that the composition of the executive should follow the spirit of progressive development as described in the 1984 Green Paper and White Paper on the Further Development of Representative Government.

#### Preliminary views

8. On balance a majority of Panel Members felt that it would be inappropriate to effect any significant change to the existing system in 1988. The existing appointment system should continue for the selection of Executive Council Members irrespective of whether there would be any change or otherwise in the role of the Executive Council. To provide closer liaison with the Legislative Council, more Executive Council Members should be chosen from the Legislative Council. Furthermore, individual Executive

Council Members should be given more responsibility to chair major Government policy advisory committees so as to enhance the channelling of the needs of the community into the policy formulation process. In this connection, Members agreed that these advisory committees should be viewed as part of the executive machinery.

0116V

## Chapter 4 : Composition of the Legislature

The Panel examined the existing composition of the Legislative Council, the proposals regarding the Legislative Council in the 1984 Green Paper and White Paper on the Further Development of Representative Government, and the provisions in the Joint Declaration regarding the legislature in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. Members also discussed a number of suggestions regarding the composition of the legislature based on written submissions from the public and proposals by commentators as reported in the press.

2. In their deliberations, Members examined the various issues relating to the composition of the legislature particularly the question of direct elections and then identified a number of options for further consideration. At the same time, the Panel also considered the issues of the role of the Governor as the President of the Legislative Council and whether Hong Kong should have a bicameral legislature.

### Direct elections

3. In examining the various issues relating to the composition of the legislature, the Panel studied the question of direct elections in detail based on information received and noted the following opposing views. It must be pointed out that the order in which the views are presented does not represent an order of significance in any way.

Views in favour of direct elections

- (1) The introduction of direct elections is in line with the principles of democracy and equality of political rights.
- (2) Whereas the introduction of direct elections does not necessarily lead to democracy, there cannot be true democracy without direct elections.
- (3) The introduction of direct elections would provide a stronger link between the public and the legislature.
- (4) Direct elections would ensure a more accountable, open and responsive Government leading to a better safeguard for the rule of law.
- (5) This is the type of election adopted in most capitalist countries and is therefore eminently suitable to the future Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) where capitalism will continue for 50 years.
- (6) According to the Joint Declaration, it is only the economic system and our present way of life which will not be changed; but changes to the political system are envisaged and are clearly set out in the Joint Declaration.
- (7) The advocates of direct elections do not wish to introduce direct elections for the sake of change; but they feel that it is the only way to ensure that the Government of the Hong Kong SAR will be made accountable to the people so that it can exercise the high degree of autonomy promised in the Joint Declaration and be able to safeguard the interests of the people of Hong Kong in future conflict of interest situations between the Hong Kong SAR and the central government.
- (8) Whether to introduce direct elections in 1988 is a matter

for the British Administration. It is of course desirable that there be convergence in 1997. But there are only very few people who do not wish to see direct elections in 1997. The minimum percentage for 1997 is 25 percent and so long as we do not exceed this percentage in 1988, it will not cause any divergence in 1997.

- (9) Even if direct elections will lead to the formation of political parties it is not necessarily a bad thing for Hong Kong because of the peculiar conditions of Hong Kong: (a) everybody in Hong Kong (both the elector and the elected) knows full well that in order to continue to be useful to China, Hong Kong must not do anything which will jeopardize its prosperity; (b) there are already some political organizations in Hong Kong which had participated in the last elections. These are totally different from the political parties in the United Kingdom and it is unlikely that the adversarial politics in the United Kingdom will ever occur in Hong Kong particularly when the entire legislature is not envisaged to be constituted by direct elections; and (c) the working class in Hong Kong are much more reasonable than their counterparts in other countries in their demand for better working conditions.
- (10) Direct elections would enhance prosperity and stability, as the public would have more confidence in the Government. Foreign investors look at the entire structure of Hong Kong before investing here and if they should see democracy with direct elections successfully implemented in Hong Kong, that would strengthen their confidence in investing in Hong Kong.
- (11) Public response mentioned in the 1984 White Paper generally favoured the introduction of a very small number of directly elected members in 1988. The Assessment Office Report also mentioned that the Hong Kong Government planned to introduce a progressive



development of a more representative legislature with seats filled by direct election.

- (12) This is a logical step in the development of representative government after the successful implementation of indirect elections in 1985, and that the Legislative Council has since been functioning smoothly.
- (13) Direct elections would enhance public support of Government's policies and their sense of belonging to Hong Kong.
- (14) This would further promote civic education and the public's participation in a civic education process as the possession of a vote and the exercise of the right to vote would enhance civic awareness.
- (15) The people of Hong Kong will be ready for direct elections by 1988 because the great majority are literate and read quite a few newspapers everyday so that they will be in a position to receive the full benefit of civic education processes introduced by the Government.
- (16) It has not been demonstrated at all that direct elections will lead to 'free lunch' policies.

#### Views not in favour of direct elections

- (1) Direct elections are not the only form of democratic government, nor the only assurance that political rights will be safeguarded. Democracy in its truest form is an ideal and as such may not be suitable or practical for all nations.
- (2) Without direct elections there could still be democracy and the rule of law must be maintained regardless whether there are direct elections.

- (3) Direct elections may not necessarily achieve the objectives desired by the advocates of direct elections.
- (4) Direct elections may lead to a legislature which is not balanced in terms of the representation of the various sectors in the community.
- (5) There is no empirical evidence to suggest that indirectly elected members do not provide sufficient links to the public, or that Government would be more accountable to directly elected as against indirectly elected members.
- (6) Without a stable government, direct elections may not necessarily produce a truly democratic government.
- (7) Because Hong Kong has a capitalist economic system, this does not necessarily mean that the democracy as practised in other capitalist countries must be copied here. Political systems including direct elections based on universal franchise in other countries have developed over decades, even centuries, and were not put in place from one year to the next. The reality of Asian traditions and of Hong Kong's dependent status as a future SAR of China must also be borne in mind when deciding on the appropriate political system to be adopted. Not all capitalist countries have been successful in maintaining political stability through direct elections; many have been adjusting electoral systems over time.
- (8) The question of convergence of constitutional reform in Hong Kong with the Basic Law for the future HKSAR is one of timing. The outcome of the discussion on the nature of constitutional reform will no doubt have to find some reflection in the arrangements to be put in place for the period after 1997; there is therefore no need to call for direct elections in 1988 on the grounds that they may be

a feature of the system from 1997 onwards. There is no conclusive evidence to date that the majority of the population supports direct elections in 1988, or in 1997.

- (9) Direct elections would most likely lead to the formation of political parties in Hong Kong which might introduce adversarial politics. It is pure speculation and somewhat unrealistic to assume that political parties in Hong Kong would act differently from political parties elsewhere in the world and therefore be less adversarial. Hong Kong has the added problem of substantial foreign political interests conceivably wishing to become involved in party politics should such developments occur. Political parties, in order to succeed to power, are required to make promises or concessions - these may or may not be ultimately for the common good. No such direct pressures have in the past acted on the civil service government, and a legislature composed of indirectly elected members would provide for a greater variety of competing interests and ultimately for better balance and greater moderation in the creation of policies and their implementation. The degree of autonomy for the future HKSAR will not be determined by the specifics of the electoral systems in Hong Kong but by whether Hong Kong can maintain its capitalist system and provide economic benefits to China.
- (10) Although public response mentioned in the 1984 White Paper was in favour of the introduction of a very small number of directly elected members in 1988 and the Assessment Office Report also mentioned that Government planned to introduce direct elections, there has not been any assessment of the merits and demerits of direct elections after the 1986 Urban Council/Regional Council elections. Therefore it has been suggested that since the results of the 1986 elections seem to have favoured the candidates of certain professions, such as teachers and social workers, direct elections to the Legislative

Council should not be introduced until an assessment of the representative capacity of the successful candidates in the 1986 elections has been made.

- (11) It is feared that direct elections would lead to the introduction of 'free lunch' policies.
- (12) Hong Kong is not ready for direct elections because the level of civic awareness and civic education is still in an early stage of development. Civic education should precede a system of direct elections to establish the proper political environment based on wide-spread informed public opinion; direct elections should not in themselves be seen as producing better civic education. Political maturity requires time and tradition and is not simply the result of literacy or the number of newspaper readers in a given community.
- (13) As there is general apathy towards politics in general and elections in particular, manipulation of certain segments of society is possible in which case the participating electorate may not be totally representative of the population.
- (14) Direct elections are seen by many as a radical departure from the political system that has over the years developed in Hong Kong and which has produced outstanding commercial and financial success for the territory and greater prosperity for a large part of the population. Direct elections, so it is feared, must inevitably lead to the formation of political parties which have to project differing platforms and candidates to create a choice for voters. Hong Kong people will need to spend more time and energy in political debate, at the expense of productive commercial involvement. Political parties and election campaigns could easily create divisions

within the population, and doubts about continuity and stability of Government policies. This would have a negative impact on confidence at home and abroad. Hong Kong will, in particular, continue to need the confidence of investors from abroad who have in the past been attracted to the territory partially because of the relative lack of political activity at central government level.

- (15) An opposition to direct elections does not mean an opposition to change in general, and it is accepted that the appointment system for Legislative Council Members will need to give way to a system of elected members. The debate is therefore not about change per se, but about the nature, degree, and timing of change, bearing in mind that prosperity and stability should be safeguarded as best as possible to ensure the optimal future for Hong Kong and its people under the 'one-country, two-systems' concept.
- (16) The 'logical' step in the development of representative government in Hong Kong should be the reduction of the number of appointed members and the extension of the number of members elected by functional constituencies and District Board/Urban Council/Regional Council electoral colleges.
- (17) Hong Kong should first develop its strength and stability through the functional constituencies. Direct elections in 1988 is too early and may lay Hong Kong open to a power struggle here of political forces from outside of Hong Kong.
- (18) In the history of Hong Kong there have been rare occasions when government policies were not supported, and whenever this happened, Government has not been unresponsive to opposition. Hong Kong has a system based largely on Government by consensus and it is questionable

whether a system of direct elections by itself would generate more of such consensus.

Possible options of composition

4. The Panel identified the following options for further consideration:-

(i) Option A

Under this option, the existing categories of Legislative Council Members would remain but their relative proportions might change. In other words, the existing system of indirect elections based on electoral colleges and functional constituencies would be maintained but the number of LegCo Members in each of the existing categories and their relative proportions might change.

(ii) Option B

This option also maintained the existing categories of LegCo Members except that the right to vote in the District Board electoral college constituencies would be transferred from District Board members to the general electorate of individual District Board electoral college constituencies.

(iii) Option C

This option proposed to replace the electoral college constituencies elections by direct elections. The other categories of LegCo Members would not be affected.

(iv) Option D

Under this option, direct elections would be

introduced in addition to the existing categories of LegCo Members, including the present indirect election system based on electoral college constituencies and functional constituencies.

(v) Absolutely no change

The Panel noted that there was a body of opinion in Hong Kong which preferred absolutely no change in the present political system in 1988. Although the Panel considered that "absolutely no change" was unrealistic as an option, it was nevertheless agreed that this suggestion should be acknowledged in the report.

5. The following table illustrates the above options by way of several combinations. It must be pointed out that the numbers in the table are given for illustration purposes only. They do not represent the Panel's views in any way.

<u>Category of Members</u>	<u>Current</u>	<u>Option A</u>	<u>Option B</u>	<u>Option C</u>	<u>Option D</u>
returned from DB electoral colleges	10	10+?(1)	10+?(1)	0(2)	10+?(3)
returned from Urban Council/Regional Council electoral colleges(4)	2	2+?(1)	2+?(1)	0(2)	2+?(3)
returned from functional constituencies(5)	12	12+?	12+?	12+?	12+?
appointed by the Governor	22	22-?	22-?	22-?	22-?
returned from direct elections based on geographical constituencies(6)	0	0	0	12+?	X
Official Members	10	10+?	10+?	10+?	10+?
Total	56	56+?	56+?	56+?	56+X+?

\*Footnotes

- (1) Both Options A & B preserve the basic structure of the existing indirect election system. But Option B proposes to transfer the right to vote from the District Board members to the general electorate whilst the District Board members would have the power to nominate candidates for election, thereby providing an initial screening process for potential candidates.
- (2) Under Option C, electoral college elections would be replaced by direct elections. No Members will thus be returned from electoral colleges, hence cutting off the link between LegCo and Urban Council/Regional Council, and District Boards.
- (3) Option D is similar to Option A except that direct elections are introduced in addition to indirect elections. The number of seats allocated to each category may have to be adjusted having regard to the introduction of direct elections.
- (4) For the sake of clarity, Members returned from the Urban/Regional Councils are shown under a separate category.
- (5) Functional constituencies are retained in all four options.



- (6) Direct elections are introduced under Options C & D. The number X has yet to be decided.

Issues Arising from the Possible Options

6. The Panel noted the following issues arising from the four options described in paragraph 4 :-

- (a) the suitable tenure of office for Members returned from direct elections (Options C & D) in relation to Members in other categories;
- (b) the election cycle of direct elections. Is there a potential problem of causing confusion to the electors because of too many elections within a single year? (Options C & D);
- (c) what criteria should be used to draw up the geographical constituencies for direct elections? Should it be based solely on existing District Board boundaries or should other factors such as population distribution and physical characteristics be taken into consideration? (Options C & D);
- (d) how could an effective linkage with District Boards and the Urban/Regional Councils be maintained if electoral college elections are to be replaced by direct elections? (Option C);
- (e) the incorporation of direct elections into the existing system without modifications would give rise to two categories of elected Members (Option D i.e. double representation - one returned from direct elections and the other from electoral college elections); and

- (f) how should functional constituencies be chosen from various groups in the community and how should their representatives be elected? Should a review be conducted at regular intervals to determine the optimal mix of organizations to be classified as functional constituencies?

7. As a matter of principle, the Panel decided to consider these options in detail and that the pros and cons of each option should be included in its report. The Panel then discussed the possible timing for these changes as some Members suggested that these changes should be implemented in 1988 whilst others suggested 1991. The Panel also bore in mind the longer term implications of these options.

#### Pros and cons

8. The pros and cons expressed so far, in respect of the options mentioned in para. 4 above may be summarized as follows :-

#### Option A

Under this option, the existing categories of Legislative Council Members would remain but their relative proportions might change. In other words, the existing system of indirect elections based on electoral colleges and functional constituencies would be maintained but the number of LegCo Members in each of the existing categories and their relative proportions might change.

#### Pros

- (1) Maintaining the existing framework of LegCo but varying the numerical

#### Cons

- (1) This option could create an impression that there is no progress in the

composition of its Members only reflects a shift of emphasis rather than a fundamental change in its composition. This has the support of a certain part of the community as a steady move towards the gradual development of representative government in Hong Kong.

development of representative government.

(2) It is not desirable to introduce major changes to the existing system. Anyhow, some consider that at this stage it is still too early to judge the effectiveness of the present system which should be given more time to prove itself before introducing any major changes.

(2) The chance in 1988 should be taken to introduce the necessary changes, such as direct elections, so that more time is available for adaptations and adjustments to be made, if necessary, as some feel that this might be the last meaningful review.

(3) If this option is chosen, Government could be criticized as a "lame duck administration" which would adversely affect public confidence.

Option B

This option also maintained the existing categories of LegCo Members except that the right to vote in the District Board electoral college constituencies would be transferred from District Board members to the general electorate of individual District Board electoral college constituencies.

Pros

Cons

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (1) The valuable link between LegCo and DBs would be preserved because of the involvement of DBs in the nomination process.   | (1) This option will diminish the role of the DBs in the LegCo elections and will dilute the link between LegCo and DBs.   |
| (2) This system of nomination by the DB members and voting by the general electorate will enhance the degree of monitoring of the elected representative by and his accountability to his constituents. | (2) If the constituencies in the electoral college elections are small, the background of the candidates may be rather homogeneous thereby presenting voters with little choice. |
| (3) This option is already one step forward in the further development of representative government.  | (3) There would still be a problem of possible conflicts amongst DB members over the nomination of candidates.   |

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| (4) With DB members being involved in the election process, there may not be a need for the participation of political parties.       | (4) As the number of electors will be increased, there may be a problem of campaign expenditure i.e. if the limit is set too high, the candidates may not be able to afford the funds, but if it is too low, it may not be adequate. |
| (5) The problem involving internal conflicts among DB members due to the existing electoral college election system would be reduced. | (5) The electoral college election system should not be drastically changed just after one term, as it may affect the public image of the DBs.   |
| (6) This option introduces an element of direct elections.  | (6) By restricting nomination to the DBs, Government may be criticized as not going far enough and it may affect the results of the nomination, because 1/3 of the membership of the DBs are still appointed by the Government.      |
| (7) Through the DB nomination process the quality of candidates could be  | (7) This is seen to be a compromise between status quo of electoral college elections and  |

improved and the number of candidates could also be controlled.

direct elections. It would not satisfy either the supporters or the opponents of direct elections.

(8) There will not be the problem of double representation as in Option D.

(8) Some strong doubts have been expressed on the desirability or effectiveness of screening. Further, people outside of the DBs would find it very difficult to be nominated. There would also be more opportunities for corrupt practices as the number of people with the power to nominate is rather small.

(9) The election is similar to the Urban/Regional Councils election and to some people this would probably be confusing.

### Option C

This option proposed to replace the electoral college constituencies elections by direct elections. The other categories of LegCo Members would not be affected.

#### Pros

(1) By replacing the electoral college elections with direct elections, there will

#### Cons

(1) This option will cut off the link between LegCo and the DBs, UC and RC.

not be a problem of  
double representation.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| (2) This option introduces direct elections to the composition of LegCo. | (2) This would reduce the variety of representation of the Council as compared with Option D.  |
|  | (3) It is too early to remove the link with the DBs without the time to evaluate the success or deficiencies of the system. It may not be acceptable to the DBs. |
|  | (4) Some may criticize that there will not be any initial screening of candidates as compared with Option B.   |
|  | (5) The introduction of direct elections may lead to the formation of political parties.   |

#### Option D

Under this option, direct elections would be introduced in addition to the existing categories of LegCo Members, including the present indirect election system based on electoral college constituencies and functional constituencies.

Pros

Cons

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| (1) This option introduces direct elections whilst maintaining the existing categories of LegCo Members.  | (1) There may be a problem of double representation if two categories of Members are elected by the same constituencies.  |
| (2) There will be more variety and a wider base of representation on LegCo because of the introduction of a new category of LegCo Members.  | (2) The existing problem of one LegCo Member representing more than one district in the electoral colleges is unresolved. |
| (3) This is a fulfilment of Government's commitment in the 1984 White Paper and the Assessment Office Report.   | (3) As the size of the electorate is enlarged in direct elections, there may be a problem of campaign funding.            |
| (4) This will enable the Government and the public to assess the merits and demerits of all three types of elections before deciding to take the next step towards democratization. | (4) It may lead to political party involvement in direct elections.   |
|   | (5) With an additional category of LegCo Members, there may be a problem of balancing the representation of the           |



different sectors of  
the community on LegCo.

- (6) There should not be  
experimentation with  
something as fundamental  
as constitutional reform.

### Electoral Colleges and Functional Constituencies

9. The Panel also discussed several points of detail regarding the electoral colleges and functional constituencies.

10. Regarding electoral colleges, there was a suggestion that each District Board should have a seat on LegCo. But it was also pointed out that this would significantly increase the number of electoral college seats on LegCo. However, the Panel accepted the possibility that in order to allow a degree of flexibility the number of seats allocated to the District Board electoral college constituencies might be slightly adjusted because of population shifts or constituency boundary changes.

11. There were suggestions that the number of functional constituencies should be increased to include other functional groups. The Panel also noted a suggestion to review the mechanics of the functional constituencies elections i.e. several related but not mutually exclusive trades could be combined to form one multi-member constituency.

### Timing for Direct Elections

12. In the light of the possible options described in para. 4 above, the Panel discussed three options regarding timing for direct elections if such were to be introduced:-

- (a) to introduce direct elections in 1988;

- (b) to introduce direct elections in 1991 or later;  
and
- (c) not to introduce direct elections at any time  
before 1997.

13. It was also pointed out that the question of the definition of direct elections as well as whether there would be restrictions as to candidature or nomination, such as limiting the power of nomination to the District Boards, should be addressed. If direct elections were to be introduced, the number and proportion of directly elected Members should also be considered.

#### Screening of Candidates

14. In the context of the Panel's discussion regarding direct elections, Members noted the suggestion that perhaps candidates standing for direct elections should be required to be nominated by a stipulated number of District Board members. There were two different views on this matter. Those who suggested this type of screening took the view that it would reduce the number of candidates as well as provide some quality control of candidates. But those who were opposed to screening felt that such a screening process was against the principle of free participation in direct elections, and further doubted the effectiveness of such a system in controlling the quality of candidates because in practice it would limit the candidates to members of the District Boards thus excluding other potentially better candidates who were not members of the District Boards.

#### Single or Multi-seat Constituencies

15. In its discussion of this subject, the Panel noted several suggestions, as follows :-

- (a) single-seat constituencies should be used in electoral college elections to maintain the level of direct accountability;
- (b) if all LegCo Members were to be directly elected, single-seat constituencies should be used;
- (c) multi-seat constituencies could be used in direct elections if the geographical representation element was already embodied in the District Board electoral college elections; and
- (d) if only a proportion of LegCo Members were directly elected, multi-seat constituencies might be used.

#### Appointed Members

16. In respect of Appointed Members, the Panel's preliminary view was that their proportion could be reduced in 1988. However, there were also different views on this matter, as follows :-

- (a) there should be no change in the number of Appointed Members in 1988;
- (b) the proportion of Appointed Members could be reduced by maintaining the existing number but increasing the number of Members in the other categories; and
- (c) the number of Appointed Members should be reduced.

Official Members

17. In respect of the Official Members, the Panel discussed the following different suggestions :-

- (a) there should be no change in the number and role of Official Members in 1988;
- (b) there should be no change in the number of Official Members in 1988, but :
  - (i) in order to fully cover the various policy areas in LegCo and without increasing the number of Official Members, Government officials other than Official Members could be in attendance at LegCo sittings; or
  - (ii) in order to adequately deal with the business of the day and without increasing the number of Official Members, Government should appoint different Official Members for particular sittings from amongst a team of officials depending on the nature of business to be transacted;
- (c) the number of Official Members may be increased slightly, but their proportion in relation to other Members may be reduced; and
- (d) the number and proportion of Official Members should be reduced in 1988.

18. The Panel noted that the suggestion to increase the number of Official Members was mainly due to the concern over the efficiency of the work of LegCo which might be affected because certain policy areas were not represented by their respective Secretaries. At the same time, the Panel also noted the arguments against increasing the number of Official Members which included the provisions in the Joint Declaration that the legislature of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region would be constituted by elections. The Panel was aware of certain views in support of the development towards a ministerial system in Hong Kong.

19. The Panel did not reach any conclusions regarding the subject of Official Members.

#### Governor as President of Legislative Council

20. The Panel discussed the proposal to replace the Governor as the President of the Legislative Council by an elected Presiding Officer from amongst the Members. Most Members noted that by keeping the dual role of the Governor and the President of LegCo in one person it would enhance stability and efficiency. The Governor, as head of the Government would be able to maintain a direct link with the Legislative Council and to keep in close touch with the affairs of the legislature. There is also merit in maintaining the Governor's role as LegCo's President because this would enhance the public image of LegCo. On the other hand, some held the view that an elected Presiding Officer would project an image of LegCo as a body independent of government control. Moreover, with the roles of the Governor and the President of LegCo separated it would avoid the problem of incompatibility of roles and relieve the Governor of some of his heavy work load.

21. After careful examination, a majority of Panel Members agreed that this proposal should not be implemented in the immediate future, at least not in 1988.

Bicameral Legislature

22. The Panel also discussed the suggestion regarding a bicameral legislature in Hong Kong. The Panel was of the view that a bicameral system was not suitable for Hong Kong under the present circumstances because it involved drastic changes to the existing system. Nevertheless, the Panel appreciated that in future there might be a case for additional checks and balances to be provided for in the legislature. The feasibility of a bicameral system could then be reviewed.

0116V

## Chapter 5 :        Relationship between the Executive and the                          Legislature

The Panel studied, by way of background information, the relationship between the executive and the legislature in a number of countries and in Hong Kong. It also examined the proposals regarding the relationship between the Executive Council and the Legislative Council in the 1984 Green Paper and White Paper on the Further Development of Representative Government, and the provisions in the Joint Declaration regarding the relationship between the Executive and the Legislature in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. Then the Panel discussed the possible further development of the present system in Hong Kong.

### Relationship between the Executive and the Legislature in Other Countries

2.        To facilitate the Panel's discussion of the subject, Members considered a brief comparative study of the relationship between the Executive and the Legislature in four countries : the United Kingdom, the United States of America, the People's Republic of China, and Switzerland.

### Relationship between the Executive and the Legislature in Hong Kong

3.        The Panel examined the existing situation, the proposals regarding the relationship between the Executive Council and the Legislative Council in the 1984 Green Paper and White Paper, as well as the relevant provisions in the Joint Declaration.

4. With a view to improving the overall efficiency of the Government, the Panel examined the existing relationship in Hong Kong in terms of accountability and separation of powers from four angles, namely, enactment of legislation, control of public expenditure, monitoring, and dismissal. The Panel noted that :-

- (a) the executive is already accountable in a number of ways, such as questions and debates in the Legislative Council, and through various standing/select committees under the legislature;
- (b) financial accountability is a prominent feature;
- (c) the relationship is not necessarily a vertical one; and
- (d) the power of dismissal of the executive by the legislature is not provided for in Hong Kong.

5. From the point of view of efficiency, the Panel noted that on the whole, the existing relationship between the executive and the legislature in Hong Kong seemed to function efficiently. The executive was responsible for policy decisions including whether the public should be consulted on particular issues. Where the implementation of such policy decisions required legislation, the appropriate bill would be introduced into the Legislative Council by the Administration. It would be the responsibility of the legislature to enact the legislation. However, the Panel agreed that the existing relationship could be strengthened by more informal two-way communication preferably on a regular basis. On the other hand, the Panel considered that the working relationship and the policy formulation process would be improved if more Legislative Council Members were appointed to the policy advisory committees in their personal capacity.



6. As regards the control of public expenditure, the Panel noted that under the principle of separation of powers, it would be up to the executive to make proposals regarding public expenditure but the legislature was responsible for ensuring that the funds sought were no more than was necessary for achieving the approved policy objectives.

7. The function of the legislature in monitoring the executive depended upon the initiative from the legislature itself. In addition to the existing formal instruments of monitoring in the Legislative Council i.e. the Public Accounts Committee, Legislative Council Questions, Legislative Council Debates, and Legislative Council Select Committees, the Panel agreed that consideration should be given to the setting up of a system of standing committees in LegCo to monitor the corresponding policy issues, as in the United Kingdom Parliament. These committees were a part of the legislature performing a monitoring role and were different from the policy advisory committees of the executive branch of government. The concern of these committees would be policy matters rather than the monitoring of the day-to-day administration of the affairs of Government.

#### Further Development

8. Having examined the existing relationship with a view to improving the overall efficiency of the Government, the Panel agreed that the principle of separation of powers between the executive and the legislature should be upheld. It also considered that the input of the Legislative Council in the policy making process could be improved, and a few suggestions were listed below:-

- (a) strengthening the existing relationship between the Executive Council and the Legislative Council by way of more informal but regular two-way communication;

- (b) appointing more Legislative Council Members to serve on policy advisory committees in their personal capacity; and
- (c) considering further the setting up of a system of standing policy monitoring committees under the Legislative Council in respect of the various policy areas.

0116V

## Chapter 6 : Electoral Provisions

The Panel reviewed the three elections held in 1985 and 1986 i.e. the District Board elections on 7 March 1985, the Legislative Council elections on 26 September 1985, and the Urban Council/Regional Council elections on 6 March 1986, during in-house discussions as well as a meeting with the Administration.

2. The Panel also studied the subject of electoral provisions in general. The specific issue of voting age was also examined.

3. On the subject of the three elections, the Panel invited members of the public, especially the candidates who participated in the elections, to express their views on whether there were problematic areas and what improvements could be made.

### Areas for Further Improvement

#### (i) Registration of Electors

4. The Panel noted that the Administration kept under review the effectiveness of its voter registration drive including the "door-to-door" visits. Whereas it was accepted that a high registration rate might affect the voting rate, Government had the responsibility to ensure that all eligible electors were registered. The Panel also noted that it was difficult to effect "automatic" registration as the Immigration Department computer records did not include addresses nor years of residence. It was also difficult to keep the records up-to-date as changes in addresses were not always reported.

The Panel concluded that there should not be "automatic" registration and that potential electors who have the responsibility should take the initiative to exercise their right to register and to vote.

5. In order to facilitate the updating of the general electoral roll, the Panel suggested that Government should set up a centralized address system of registered electors whereby address changes known to any one department could be made known to the Registration and Electoral Division.

6. The Panel suggested that Government should lengthen the registration period to enable qualified electors to register throughout the year subject to a cut-off date before each election. The Administration has implemented this suggestion by way of the Electoral Provisions (Registration of Electors) (Amendment) Regulations 1986 which allow applications for voter registration to be accepted on a year-round basis.

(ii) General Electoral Roll

7. The Panel discussed whether the residential requirement for candidature and registration as electors should be amended. On balance, the Panel recommended that there should be no change to the existing requirements i.e. 10 years ordinary residence immediately preceding nomination for candidates; and 7 years ordinary residence immediately preceding registration for electors.

(iii) Ballot Papers

8. The Panel considered the suggestions that the tick (✓) or the circle (0) should be used on the ballot paper instead of the cross (X). It was suggested that the cross usually indicated disapproval, especially in traditional Chinese thinking. However, the Panel considered that as the cross had always been used in the elections so far, it would only cause confusion if a change was made. Therefore the Panel

recommended that the cross should continue to be used but Government should step up publicity in this area.

9. The Panel also recommended that poster-size sample ballot papers with candidates' photographs should continue to be used in assisting illiterate voters.

(iv) Hong Kong Belongers and Persons with the Right to Land in Hong Kong

---

10. The Panel concluded that the right to vote should be granted to persons with the right of abode in Hong Kong and persons with the right to land in Hong Kong who had ordinarily resided in Hong Kong for the 7 years immediately preceding registration, subject to other relevant qualifications, such as age.

(v) Civil Servants and Elections

11. The Panel noted the present position in Hong Kong and in other countries regarding civil servants participating in elections and discussed the following alternative options if the restrictions were relaxed:-

- (a) no pay leave whilst in office as elected member;
- (b) resignation if elected and apply afresh if wanted to join the civil service later;
- (c) civil servants in the lower ranks might be allowed to stand for District Board elections; and
- (d) on leave 6 months before election and resign if elected.

12. In their discussion, Panel Members noted that some civil servants drew a comparison between their situation and that of the employees in the subvented sector who were allowed to stand for election as candidates without having to resign from office beforehand.

13. After discussing the pros and cons of the above options, the Panel agreed, on balance, that there should be no change to the present position for the time being i.e. civil servants might register as electors just like any other persons but were disqualified for being nominated as a candidate or being elected unless they resign beforehand, in order to avoid a conflict of interest and possible abuse of power.

(vi) Uncontested Elections

14. In discussing the suggestion that candidates elected uncontested should be required to undergo a "vote of confidence", the Panel noted that it would be difficult to define the degree of confidence in a candidate who had been elected uncontested. There would also be practical problems. If the candidate did not obtain the required number of votes i.e. whether a by-election should be held and if there were still only one candidate? Should the required number of votes (degree of confidence) be required of candidates in contested elections? What if the candidate with the highest number of votes did not exceed the required number? Should a second ballot be held?

15. On balance, the Panel agreed that there was no need for candidates elected uncontested to undergo a "vote of confidence".

## Alternative Polling Methods for Legislative Council Elections

16. The Panel discussed the following different methods of polling with their respective pros and cons.

(i) Preferential vote with withdrawal (Single-Member Preferential System)

17. In the preferential system with a withdrawal requirement voters were required to indicate their preferences. Except when a majority has been established, the candidate with the least number of first preference votes would be eliminated and his votes showing preferences for other candidate were redistributed until one candidate obtained a majority of votes. This method enabled the selection of the candidate with the greatest degree of support from those voters who indicated their preferences. But the winning candidate might not actually obtain the support of over 50% of those who voted because if voters were not required to indicate preferences for all candidates and if not all voters exercised all their preferences, the winning candidate might be decided by a few who indicated a second or lower preference.

(ii) The Double-Ballot

18. In the double-ballot a second poll would be held some time later between the two candidates with the highest number of votes if no candidate obtained a majority in the first poll. This method ensured that the winning candidate had a clear majority support of the electorate. But this method might confuse the voters as they may be required to vote two times. It was more expensive, both in terms of administrative expenses and the time spent by the electorate in going to the poll two times. If only a few voters turned out in the second ballot, the result might not be representative.

(iii) The Alternative Vote

19. In the alternative vote voters were required to indicate an alternative choice which would be used to determine the winning candidate if no candidate obtained a majority of first choices. This method suffered drawbacks similar to the preferential vote with withdrawal. But it was more likely for voters to indicate an alternative vote because they were required to show one more preference only.

(iv) Single-transferable Vote (Multi-Member Preferential System)

20. Voters were allowed to rank-order the candidates from 1 to a number equal to the number of vacant seats in the constituency. Once voting was completed, the first preferences were counted and the number necessary for election was determined as follows:-

$$\frac{\text{Total number of valid votes cast}}{\text{Number of seats in the constituency} + 1}$$

21. Any candidate with first preference votes exceeding the above number was elected. He might have more votes than this number, in which case the excess votes would be wasted. To avoid this, the excess votes were distributed in accordance with the second preferences of all votes which were to be discounted in value by a factor

$$\text{i.e. } \frac{\text{Number of excess votes}}{\text{Total number of second preferences}}$$

In the second round, the candidate with the highest number of votes was elected, if his total now exceeded the required number, and his excess votes were distributed in the same way as before except that if any of his second preferences were for a candidate already elected, these were replaced by the third



preferences; similarly some of his votes might be second (or lower) preferences from others already elected, and again the next lowest preferences were substituted.

22. Then if there were still seats or if at any stage there were seats to be filled and no candidate exceeded the required number, the preferential vote with withdrawal method (para. 17 above) was used. This method was particularly useful in large constituencies with a large number of candidates.

23. The main drawbacks of this system were similar to the preferential vote and the alternative vote described above i.e. if a large proportion of the electorate did not indicate their preferences, the results might not be representative. This system was also very complicated and might not be easily understood by the electorate who might lose confidence in it.

#### (v) The List System

24. In the List System, electors could only vote for one list of candidates and the number of seats to be obtained by each list of candidates depended on the percentage of votes won by that list of candidates. There were also variations which might allow electors to vote across lists, alter the order of the list of candidates, or to vote for more than one list.

#### Voting age

25. The Panel discussed the suggestion to lower the voting age from 21 to 18. This would add about 260,000 to the number of eligible electors.

26. Panel Members expressed different views on the matter. Some were in favour of the suggestion to lower the voting age from 21 to 18 whilst others maintained that the voting age did not necessarily have to be the same as the age of majority.

27. Those in favour of lowering the voting age to 18 maintained that:-

- (a) this was one step forward in civic education;
- (b) this would increase the registration rate, especially for voters between 18 and 21 thus providing more people with the opportunity to participate in a civic education process; and
- (c) if the age of majority was lowered to 18, there was no reason why the voting age should not follow.

28. Those who had reservations about lowering the voting age felt that voting was more than making a personal decision and doubted whether Hong Kong was ready for such a change in view of the low level of civic education and civic awareness. Furthermore they felt that as there might be many changes in 1988, therefore it would not be appropriate to introduce yet another major change.

29. As there was no consensus amongst Panel Members, it was agreed that the Panel would keep this matter in close view, especially the views of the public in the context of the 1987 Review. The Panel suggested that this issue be included in the 1987 Review.

#### Preliminary views

30. The Panel noted that the majority system was used in the last Legislative Council election mainly because of the need to ensure that the successful candidates were able to obtain the support of the majority of the electorate and thus were "representative". However in studying the various alternative methods under the majority system, the Panel was not entirely satisfied with the way in which the majority was obtained. For example, in the preferential system such as the

Alternative Vote and the Single Transferable Vote (either Single-Member or Multi-Member), it was possible that a meaningful majority would not occur if a large proportion of the electorate did not exercise all their preferences. Furthermore, even if a majority did occur, it might be the result of second or lower preference votes.

31. The Panel agreed that on balance, it seemed that the principle of plurality should be adopted for elections in general. In elections involving a very small electorate for example, the electoral college elections, the multi-ballot/majority system could be used.

0116V



Composition of the Panel in 1985-86

Convener : Hon S L CHEN, CBE, DSc, JP

Deputy Convener : Hon Andrew WONG

Members : Hon Maria TAM, OBE, JP  
Hon Allen LEE, OBE, JP  
Dr Hon HO Kam-fai, OBE, JP  
Hon F K HU, OBE, JP  
Hon J J Swaine, OBE, QC, JP  
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW, OBE, JP  
Hon CHAN Ying-lun, JP  
Hon Mrs Pauline NG, JP  
Hon Hilton CHEONG-LEEN, CBE, JP  
Hon CHUNG Pui-lam  
Hon HO Sai-chu, MBE, JP  
Hon HUI Yin-fat  
Dr Hon Richard LAI  
Hon Martin LEE, QC, JP  
Hon LEE Yu-tai  
Hon PANG Chun-hoi, MBE  
Hon SZETO Wah  
Hon TAI Chin-wah  
Hon Mrs Rosanna TAM  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung  
Dr Hon Daniel TSE, OBE, JP

Composition of the Panel in 1986-87

Convener : Hon S L CHEN, CBE, DSc, JP  
Deputy Convener : Hon Andrew WONG  
Members : Hon Maria TAM, OBE, JP  
Hon Allen LEE, OBE, JP  
Dr Hon Daniel TSE, OBE, JP  
Dr Hon HO Kam-fai, OBE, JP  
Hon F K HU, OBE, JP  
Hon Stephen CHEONG, OBE, JP  
Hon Mrs Selina CHOW, OBE, JP  
Hon CHAN Ying-lun, JP  
Hon CHENG Hon-kwan  
Hon Hilton CHEONG-LEEN, CBE, JP  
Hon CHUNG Pui-lam  
Hon HO Sai-chu, MBE, JP  
Hon HUI Yin-fat  
Dr Hon Richard LAI  
Dr Hon Conrad LAM  
Hon Martin LEE, QC, JP  
Hon LEE Yu-tai  
Hon PANG Chun-hoi, MBE  
Dr Hon Helmut Sohmen  
Hon SZETO Wah  
Hon TAI Chin-wah  
Hon Mrs Rosanna TAM  
Hon TAM Yiu-chung

Dates and nature of Panel Meetings

<u>Nature of meeting</u>	<u>Date</u>	
	<u>1985-86</u>	<u>1986-87</u>
Members' in-house discussion	28 Nov 85	11 Oct 86
	14 Jan 86	25 Oct 86
	13 Mar 86	8 Nov 86
	22 Apr 86	22 Nov 86
	21 May 86	13 Dec 86
	6 Jun 86	27 Dec 86
	21 Jun 86	10 Jan 87
	5 Jul 86	17 Jan 87
	19 Jul 86	24 Jan 87
	2 Aug 86	7 Feb 87
	16 Aug 86	11 Feb 87
	30 Aug 86	
	27 Sep 86	
Meeting with the Administration	4 Feb 86	0
	28 May 86	
Informal meeting with members of Urban/Regional Councils and District Boards	0	17 Nov 86
		(2 meetings)
		18 Nov 86
		19 Nov 86
		20 Nov 86
		25 Nov 86
To receive public submissions		17 Dec 86
	24 Jul 86	1 Nov 86
	23 Sep 86	29 Nov 86
	4 Oct 86	3 Jan 87
	6 Oct 86	
<hr/>		
Total	19	21











